



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,403	12/21/2001	Lawrence R. Miller	72167-000570	2495
21967 7590 04/06/2009 HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109				
EXAMINER PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2437				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/06/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/026,403

Applicant(s)

MILLER ET AL.

Examiner

MICHAEL PYZOCHA

Art Unit

2437

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 8-20, 23 and 25-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 8-20, 23 and 25-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-20, 23, 25, and 26-29 are pending.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/03/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9-19, 23 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Squier et al. (US 7188181) in view of Sampson et al. (US 6339423).

As per claims 9-13, 17, 23 and 27, Squier et al. discloses inputting at a first system that grants session credentials based on successful authentication, a request from a client to access a protected resource on the first system, the protected resource on the first system being accessible by the client only after successful authentication of the client at the first system (see column 5 lines 54-63); determining at the first system that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the first system (see

column 5 line 64 through column 6 line 4); retrieving, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information being retrieved from the client, the information corresponding to a session credential for the second system, the second system grants session credentials based on successful authentication at the second system and includes protected resources on the second system that is accessible by the client, the protected resource on the second system being accessible by the client only after successful authentication of the client at the second system (see column 6 lines 4-15) the first system presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; the first system inputting a determination from the second system that the client has a valid session credential with the second system; and the first system effecting successful authentication to the client so as to grant access to the protected resource on the first system, to the client based on the determination from the second system that the client has a valid session credential with the second system (see column 6 line 41 through column 7 line 5 see also figure 2) the first system inputting information from the second system and in response the first system outputting to the second system a determination that the first system has a valid session credential for the client at the first system; and the second system effecting successful authentication so as to grant access to the further protected resource on the second system to the client based on the determination from the first system that the client has a valid session credential with the first system (see column 6 lines 41-56 and column 8 lines 29-63 and column 9 lines 2-4).

Squier et al. discloses that the request and session information are sent at the same time (see column 5 lines 54-63), therefore fails to disclose the session information is retrieved from the client after determining that the client does not have valid session credentials.

However, Sampson et al. teaches sending a request to a server and the server determining that the client doesn't have valid session credentials and requesting a session token from the client (see column 3 lines 34-43 where the data transmitted to the browser to go to the first server is a request to get a session token, i.e. cookies).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to request the client of Squier et al. to send a session token when it is determined that the client doesn't have valid session credentials.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow a user to obtain credentials to access a server when the user did not originally have the credentials (see Sampson et al. column 3 lines 34-43).

As per claim 14, the modified Squier et al. and Sampson et al. system discloses granting a session credential to the client by the first system, after determining that the client has a valid session credential granted by the second system (see Squier et al. column 6 lines 57-62).

As per claim 15, the modified Squier et al. and Sampson et al. system discloses maintaining the client session credential granted by the second system (see Squier et al. column 6 lines 57-64).

As per claims 16 and 19, the modified Squier et al. and Sampson et al. system discloses associating session credentials for the first system and the second system with the client (see Squier et al. column 6 lines 57-64).

As per claim 18, the modified Squier et al. and Sampson et al. system discloses granting the client session credentials for the first system (see Squier et al. column 6 lines 57-64).

5. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 20, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Squier et al. and Sampson et al. system in view of Howard et al. (US 6584505).

As per claims 1, 20, 28 and 29, the modified Squier et al. and Sampson et al. system discloses inputting at a first system that grants session credentials based on successful authentication, a request from a client to access a protected resource on the first system, the protected resource on the first system being accessible by the client only after successful authentication of the client at the first system (see Squier et al. column 5 lines 54-63); determining at the first system that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the first system (see Squier et al. column 5 line 64 through column 6 line 4 and Sampson et al. column 3 lines 34-43); after the determining retrieving, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information being retrieved from the client, the information corresponding to a session credential for the second system, the second system grants session credentials based on successful authentication at the second system and includes protected resources on the second system that is accessible by the client, the protected resource on the second

system being accessible by the client only after successful authentication of the client at the second system (see Squier et al. column 6 lines 4-15 and Sampson et al. column 3 lines 34-43) the first system presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; the first system inputting a determination from the second system that the client has a valid session credential with the second system; and the first system effecting successful authentication to the client so as to grant access to the protected resource on the first system, to the client based on the determination from the second system that the client has a valid session credential with the second system (see Squier et al. column 6 line 41 through column 7 line 5 see also figure 2).

The modified Squier et al. and Sampson et al. system fails to disclose directing the client to the first system to establish a session credential based on successful authentication at the first system, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system.

However, Howard et al. teaches such redirection (see column 6 lines 51-52 and column 8 lines 54-57).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to redirect the client to a different server upon failed authentication.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to authenticate to a known server (see Howard et al. column 7 lines 52-65).

As per claim 2, the modified Squier et al., Sampson et al. and Howard et al. system discloses granting a session credential to the client by the first system, after

determining that the client has a valid session credential granted by the second system (see Squier et al. column 6 lines 57-62).

As per claim 3, the modified Squier et al., Sampson et al. and Howard et al. system discloses sending a session token to the client, the token corresponding to a session credential granted by the first system (see Squier et al. column 6 lines 57-62).

As per claim 4, the modified Squier et al., Sampson et al. and Howard et al. system discloses a method comprising directing the client to the second system to establish a session credential based on successful authentication at the second system, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system (see Squier et al. column 6 lines 30-40).

As per claim 6, the modified Squier et al., Sampson et al. and Howard et al. system discloses maintaining the client session credential granted by the second system (see Squier et al. column 6 lines 57-64).

As per claim 8, the modified Squier et al., Sampson et al. and Howard et al. system discloses retrieving information from the session token held by the client comprises: sending a query to the client from the first system, the query including identification as originating from a domain name corresponding to the second system; and receiving a response to the query (see Howard column 8, lines 8-11).

6. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Squier et al. and Sampson et al. system as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Marks et al. (US 20010054059).

As per claims 25 and 26 the modified Squier et al. and Sampson et al. system fails to disclose that the protected resource is pay-per-use or subscription content.

However, Marks et al. teaches content of this type (see paragraph [0028]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to protect pay-per-use and subscription content using the modified Squier et al. and Sampson et al. system.

Motivation to do so would have been that this type of content costs money and protecting them prevents free use of the content.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Squier fails to teach "receiving a session token from the client corresponding to the second system" and "granting a session credential to the client on the first system, after determining that the client has a valid session credential granted on the second system"; the motivation to combine Sampson with Squier is insufficient; such a modification would change the principle operation of Squier; Sampson fails to teach "determining, at the first system that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the first system" and the remaining references fail to cure these deficiencies.

With respect to Applicant's argument that Squier fails to teach "receiving a session token from the client corresponding to the second system" and "granting a session credential to the client on the first system, after determining that the client has a

valid session credential granted on the second system", in the Squire system the destination server (i.e. first system) receives a request with the session identifier (i.e. session token) from the origin server (i.e. second system) (see column 5 lines 64-67). After the destination server can authorize the received token it creates a new session identifier for the client with relation to the destination server (see column 6 lines 57-62). Therefore, Squire teaches the claimed limitations.

With respect to Applicant's argument that the motivation to combine Sampson with Squire is insufficient and such a modification would change the principle operation of Squire, the Squire system requires a user to send a request for a service with a session identifier thereby requiring that a user already have the session identifier (i.e. credentials). On the other hand Sampson allows a user to request a service without any credentials (i.e. session identifier or cookie) and when the first server determines that the request does not have any credentials for the first server it obtains credentials, from the client, which are from a different server to allow the user to access the first server. This provides the added benefit that the client can obtain credentials to access a server when the user did not originally have the credentials (as stated for motivation to combine). In other words this provides that a user does not have to permanently store the credentials because the user can retrieve them from the other server and only hold them long enough to send them to the first server. Furthermore, both Squire and Sampson teach methods of requesting a service from a server using session information from a different server and it would be obvious to replace Squires' method of sending the session information together with the request with Sampson's method of

sending the request separately from the session information because it would provide the predictable result of authenticating a user at a first server using session information from a second server. Additionally, it is clear that Squire and Sampson relate to similar methods with Sampson performing a step of Squire in multiple steps that would not change the principle operation of Squire.

With respect to Applicant's argument that Sampson fails to teach "determining, at the first system that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the first system", Sampson teaches that a client requests access to a system and when the system determines that the request did not include a cookie (i.e. session credential) for this system it requests the client to obtain a cookie from a different server. Therefore, when combined with the teaches of Squire, the combination teaches "determining, at the first system that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the first system".

Applicant's argument that the remaining references fail to cure the above mentioned deficiencies is moot in view of the above response.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Makower teaches single sign-on with redirection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PYZOSKA whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2437

(571)272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Pyzocha/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437